

Filed 4/12/19 P. v. Sneed CA2/5

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

VERSHONDA CHARISSE SNEED,

Defendant and Appellant.

B291982

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA137551)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Kelvin D. Filer, Judge. Affirmed.

John A. Colucci, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In 2016, a jury convicted Vershonda Charisse Sneed (defendant) of first degree murder (Pen. Code, § 187(a)¹). The jury also found true firearm allegations under section 12022.53, including the allegation that defendant personally and intentionally discharged a handgun which caused great bodily injury and death to the victim. (§ 12022.53(d).) At trial, eyewitness testimony and gunshot wound evidence established defendant shot the victim, a former close friend of hers, multiple times and continued to shoot the victim even after he fell wounded to the ground.

The trial court sentenced defendant to 50 years to life in prison: 25 years to life for the murder pursuant to section 190(a), plus a consecutive 25-year-to-life sentence for personal use of a firearm pursuant to section 12022.53(d).

In defendant's first appeal from the judgment, we affirmed her conviction but remanded to provide the trial court with an opportunity to exercise newly granted discretion to strike a firearm enhancement in the interest of justice. (§ 12022.53(h).) The trial court declined to strike the firearm enhancement pursuant to section 12022.53(d), reasoning: "[T]he young man who was killed in this case did nothing to deserve the manner in which he was executed. And executed is the word that I think [i]s appropriate. This is a situation where it wasn't just one shot fired by [defendant]. If it was, then I could see where there should be some consideration to striking the 12022.53(d) enhancement. But here we had the victim being shot multiple

¹ All undesignated statutory references that follow are to the Penal Code.

times; that the defendant literally stood over him and . . . assassinated him in cold blood. [¶] And the defendant didn't show any remorse” The trial court resentenced defendant to 50 years to life in prison.

This court appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On February 25, 2019, this court advised defendant she had 30 days to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the appellate record and are satisfied defendant's attorney has complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issue exists. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278-82; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 122-24; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, Acting P. J.

We concur:

MOOR, J.

KIM, J.